DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 917 IR 003 879

AUTHOR Werking, Richard Hume
TITLE The Library and the College: Some Programs of Library Instruction.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Cooperative Programs; Individualized Instruction; Innovation; *Library Instruction; *Library Role; Library Skills; *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

Harvie Branscomb was one of the pioneers in elucidating the interrelationship between the academic library and an institution's instructional program. His emphasis was on teaching with books, making them more accessible, and integrating them into the instructional program. Louis Shores expanded on this theme with his idea of a Library-College. This system would provide individualized instruction for students who would be tutored by someone with special subject training and who also could provide bibliographic guidance. Patricia Knapp, in her work on the Montieth Project, developed theoretical bases for library use and cooperative links with faculty which led to improved student library use and skills. More recently Evan Farber developed a program to integrate library instruction into courses at Earlham College. Using a case study approach and bibliographies of appropriate references, librarians provided lecture-demonstrations to classes in a wide range of subjects. While faculty at many academic institutions regard the library as a separate entity, at Earlham College the library and librarians are integral parts of the college community. (LS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127917

The Library and the College:

Some Programs of Library Instruction

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Richard Hume Werking

Reference Librarian

Lawrence University

IR003879

Introduction

Some academic librarians believe that knowledge and ideas have remained relatively dormant in library collections because those collections have been superfluous to the educational programs of colleges and universities. Several programs seeking to bridge the gap between the classroom and the library have emerged in recent years, and this paper examines three of them.

Background

Libraries began several millenia ago as storehouses for the graphic records of individuals, groups, or even whole civilizations. Until the present century, the college library in the United States served a similar purpose. The librarian was usually a member of the faculty, and his relationship to the library was that of custodian. He kept the key to the room which housed the books and made certain that they were safely locked up, with the exception of the few hours during the week when they could be used. Well into the twentieth century, this custodial pattern continued to predominate on many college campuses.[1]

What changed this picture of the college library (although not necessarily the library's relationship to the rest of the institution) was a combination of forces operating both within and outside the colleges after World War I. Rapid growth in the number of books expanded the size of collections and also increased student library use. Guy Lyle has referred to "an enormous increase in the use of duplicate copies of books for required reading," which took students to the library's reserve room. Another change in the curriculum at a few quality institutions, such as Harvard and Swarthmore, was the development of independent study or tutorial programs for some of the students, requiring both more extensive and intensive use of the library. The growing numbers of books, students,

and library users prompted the library to remain open for longer hours. Colleges were obliged to hire full-time librarians, graduates of the nation's library schools. These individuals were trained chiefly as public librarians and were imbued with a missionary spirit. Determined to make their books more useful, some of them not only organized the collections, but increased their availability through such devices as opening the stacks and encouraging general reading. This trend in the colleges was reinforced by the growth of American public libraries during the 1930s and 1940s, with their emphasis on a variety of user services.[2]

Such was the setting for the appearance of Harvey Branscomb's well-known volume, Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries. In 1937 the Association of American Colleges organized a study to determine how the library might "be coordinated more effectively with the educational and recreational programs of the college." The Association selected as director of the study Harvie Branscomb, Director of Libraries and Professor of Early Christian Literature at Duke University, who conferred with college and university librarians and administrators across the country in preparing his report.[3]

Branscomb examined the library use of college students and found it less than overwhelming; he used the term "astonishing." At one university, 42 per cent of the students did not check out any books from the library's general collection during a nine-week observation period, and two-thirds of the students withdrew fewer than three books. Moreover, Branscomb concluded that since there seemed little difference in the grades received by users and non-users of the library, "the teaching program in the humanities and social sciences . . . does not seem to have been in serious need of a library." He suggested that his findings were probably typical of the situation at most American colleges.[4]

Branscomb's suggestions for increasing library use centered around the

theme "teaching with books." Much of his own book discussed two issues: making books physically more accessible, and the need for instructors to propel students toward the books. "The library will be used heavily," he concluded, "only when books become the major instruments by which the educational program is carried on." Increasing the use of the library was not to be an end in itself, but instead the means to provide better education. Branscomb found barriers to education in: the inability of textbooks, and indeed any set of required readings, to meet the varied needs of individual class members; the failure of the lecture-textbook method to introduce students to the wider subject literature; the tendency of the same method to give students a one-sided view of the subject; and the lack of additional reading materials to serve an integrative function for a student's disparate courses. Greater use of the library as a source of books would presumably ameliorate these problems.[5]

Branscomb's study is widely cited and hailed in the library literature, but there is little indication that it ever had much impact on relationships between college libraries and their parent institutions. The principal reason was probably Branscomb's understandable emphasis on the need to "teach with books." With the advent of the so-called "paperback revolution" after World War II, college instructors began to use large numbers of paperbacks in their courses, often disposing of the textbook entirely. Such a development apparently met three of Branscomb's four principal objections to the status quo in college education. Students could now be introduced to the wider subject literature. As for one-sided views of the subject, there soon issued forth a plethora of "problems" or "critical issues" texts, compelling the student to confront a bewildering array of conflicting interpretations, often arranged to create false dichotomies.[6] Finally, the increasingly interdisciplinary character of scholarship, together with the great mass of paperback publications, has provided at

least some opportunity for "decompartmentalizing" a subject. The only problem area left untouched by the use of paperbacks has been Branscomb's first point--that no set of required readings can deal satisfactorily with the range of student abilities and interests, and that independent study in the library is the answer.

If Branscomb were currently revising his book, he doubtless would make extensive revisions to take into consideration the paperback revolution and its implications for library use. In some ways, he would have a larger task ahead of him now, since it is probably more difficult for instructors to see the necessity of significant library use. It has been in this climate that several programs for increasing student use of college libraries have emerged, and three of them are examined here. Although they naturally bear some similarity to Branscomb's proposals and have doubtless profited from his 1940 study, in many ways they are quite different.

Louis Shores and the "Library-College"

Louis Shores, educationist and librarian, received a B. A. in English from the University of Toledo in 1926, an M. S. in English Education from CCNY the following year, and a B. S. in Library Science from Columbia in 1929. During the 1930s and early 1940s he completed his Ph. D. in Education from Peabody College, serving first as that school's librarian and then as director of its library school. For many years after 1946 he was dean and professor at Florida State University's library school.[7]

Shores has been interested for several decades in the teaching function of the college library. But it was not until the early 1960s that occasional and sporadic ideas began to coalesce into something of a movement, with Shores at its center. On their way from a football game to a college evaluation, Shores and some administrators excitedly discussed the possibility of creating a new

educational entity--the "Library-College." Several conferences and workshops were held during the 1960s to convert college administrators, librarians, and faculty, and presumably to study ways of implementing the scheme. Little concrete has yet emerged directly from the labors of Shores and his associates. But his writings have stirred considerable attention in the library profession, prompting study and discussion of the academic librarian's instructional role.[8]

At the center of Shores's message, as articulated during the 1960s, was a cluster of assumptions and values that were tightly intertwined with developments in American higher education. More and more students, he predicted, would be flooding into colleges and especially universities, to be confronted with impersonal bureaucratic structures and huge lecture classes. Such a system was ripe for student unrest; it also could not meet the needs of the wide range of individual abilities represented in the classrooms. The answer was independent study under the guidance of a faculty which was library trained and therefore able to guide the student through a vast range of materials and information. To Shores, half of knowledge was knowing where to find it.

Shores was convinced that rising enrollment rates in colleges and universities bespoke an inexorable trend in the direction of universal higher education. "In September 1974," he asserted in 1963, "nearly every American of Freshman age will be trying to go to college." In 1966 he repeated that "it has become almost anti-social for the high-school graduate to go anywhere except to college."[9]

In Shores's opinion, rising enrollments threatened to overwhelm a system which was already overcrowded and impersonalized; his writings abound with references to long registration lines and frustrated students. Exacerbating the situation was the lecture method of instruction, which compelled classes numbering many hundreds of students to record passively the instructor's words without an opportunity for dialogue. The lecture, Shores concluded, was simply

"a rehash of information the student could gather more quickly out of . . . sophisticated library use." Fortunately, hope was on the way in the form of independent study programs. This approach was becoming more popular, and even inevitable, because of the recognition that the traditional lecture method of instruction simply could not cope with the wide range of student capabilities. Thus Shores was optimistic that higher education was ready for his Library-College.[10]

Independent study in the library was at the heart of the proposal. "To me," Shores explained at a 1966 conference, "a Library-College is a college in which the dominant learning mode is independent study by the student in the Library, bibliographically guided, intellectually aroused, and spiritually stirred by the faculty." Students would be guided, aroused, and stirred by a "new generation of faculty," whose members would presumably give up research and almost all lecturing. Professors would be bibliographically skilled and even library-trained. Shores described the Library-College faculty as "a cross between today's teaching-committed librarian and library-using teacher." As if he was not already raising questions about where to find the latter, Shores elaborated that the "library-minded classroom instructor" was one "who does not consider his specialty substantive . . . ." Professors were to hold daily office hours, not to exceed the time required by the old system for class meetings and student appointments. Moreover, the new breed of faculty would be able to match a student's individual needs to various forms of media. The prospect caused Shores to exult: "Around this new teaching technique vibrates all the qualities of motivation, and provocation, inspiration and excitement that has ever made the teacher good and great."[11]

The campus unrest in the years after 1964 added a note of urgency to arguments which had hitherto focused solely on compassion for the students as victims

of the system. Shores wanted "an end to disorder", fearing a reaction from the political and social right wing which would lead directly to 1984. His Library-College was presumably the answer to student frustrations and thus to campus unrest; he considered it "better than marching." Unfortunately, his feelings on the matter were subject to internal contradictions. On one occasion, Shores blamed campus turbulence on "the noble effort of the United States to educate every one," while another time he considered "universal higher education . . . the best insurance against violence in change."[12]

Shores believed that another important advantage of the Library-College would be what it could do for the library profession. Like many other librarians, Shores was concerned about his profession's image. Librarianship was the "noblest" of the professions, he insisted, and its literature could compare favorably with that of any other profession or discipline. Unlike many librarians, however, he considered salvation to lie in their role as educators. Because of campus unrest and universal higher education, innovation was sure to come in the structure of higher education, and librarians should be ready. They should "let clericals and automation take over management and housekeeping chores so that at long last librarianship may devote itself to one of its high roles--education." Indeed, Shores predicted, the faculty of the Library-College might be "librarians who had abandoned their ancillary complex and relegated their housekeeping and retriever duties to the subordinate place of ways and means." The education-minded librarian would doubtless "be challenged to assume the educational role so long denied him."[13]

Occasionally, Shores has written more specifically about his Library-College. No college should be larger than 500 students. Huge multiversities would be broken down into "cluster colleges" along the lines of Cambridge University in England or like Santa Cruz and Wayne State in the United States. The curriculum

should be changed to get away from narrow disciplines such as history, and to include activities such as "Etiquette" and "Marriage and the Family." There would also be a football team, of a quality to aspire to the national championship. Distress over student unrest and campus marches (which Shores once linked to "Marxian communism") even prompted him to draw up a plan for the Library-College's student government, involving campus meetings and other characteristics of participatory democracy. The college would be housed in a single building, containing at its center the library proper; surrounding the library would be faculty offices, seminar rooms, laboratories, and shops. "The proposition," Shores quoted Justin Winsor, "is to make the library the grand rendezvous of the college for teacher and pupil alike . . . ." As for finances, "Parsons College has shown the way to independence."[14]

The Library-College idea is intimately related to Shores's personal experience, as he has repeatedly pointed out. When he was a high school student with a "crush" on his young and pretty economics teacher, he wanted very much to do well in the course. Consequently, he read the section on economics in the Encyclopaedia Britannica available in his high school library. Shores received an A in the course, followed the same procedure during his college years, and came away with a lifelong conviction of the great value of encyclopedic overviews and courses. A visit in 1928 to an Antioch College economics class reinforced his interest in independent study, as he experienced "an autonomous course, in which the student studied independently under bibliographical advice by the faculty." Additional confirmation came during a Fulbright year in England, when he was impressed with the emphasis in the universities upon tutorial reading sessions and with the cluster-college concept. Somewhere along the line, Shores ran across and was inspired by Thomas Carlyle's line from Heroes and Hero Worship: "The true university these days is a collection of books."[15]

In 1934, six years before Branscomb's book appeared, Shores read a paper entitled "The Library Arts College"to the American Library Association's Chicago World's Fair convention. Still in the future, of course, were the burgeoning college and university enrollments which would give so much impetus to the Library-College movement. Nevertheless, the paper introduced more than one theme which Shores would pursue with renewed vigor some three decades later. Observing the growing part that reserve book collections and honors courses were playing in college instructional programs, he concluded that books were superseding oral instruction. The human speech of the teacher was thus fast losing a good deal of authority. Shores predicted that by 1954 these trends would result in a "library arts college,"with the library at the center of the institution's instructional life. Especially familiar to later observers was his belief that the positions of librarian and professor would merge: "Every college instructor will be library trained; every college librarian will be either a professional instructor in some field or a semi-professional housekeeper performing the necessary routines accessory to library education." (Even by then Shores had developed his strong views about the relative importance of different library functions.)[16]

The Library-College message as articulated by Shores is not without its good points. His complaints about the nature of much undergraduate education in this country, and the deleterious effects wrought on students by impersonalization and assembly-line techniques, are frequently on target. His principal goal is certainly laudable--to develop individuals with library skills who are independent, active learners instead of passive note-takers, and who learn by means of what Shores calls (perhaps with a gloss on Branscomb) the "generic book"--that is, various kinds of media.[17]

Nevertheless, there are significant drawbacks to Shores's scheme. The

Library-College idea is a slippery one. Not only is it so much a part of Shores himself, but compounding matters is the deductionist and frequently semi-mystical manner in which Shores has sought to make his case. Perhaps the most significant sentence which Shores has uttered about his proposals was also about himself. "My students know," Shores remarked in 1969, "that I have always believed in identifying solutions first; problems later." That approach is something that has probably made the program difficult to sell. Indeed, the Library-College message has the strong aura of a religion about it. One librarian entitled his review of a book by Shores "Library-College Bible," and the analogy was apt. Shores's own religious attachments come through clearly in his writings, and he himself has used such terms as "apostle" and "disciple" to refer to colleagues in the cause. He once gave the following rationale for including students in faculty-student dialogue: "There is more than an outside possibility, especially if Wordsworth's line, 'the child is father to the man' is true, and I believe it is, that the younger generation having come more recently from that mysterious eternity may have a little more of it about him [sic]."[18]

The principal obstacle to the Library-College, and a crucial one, is the great difficulty there would be in acquiring the sort of faculty which Shores envisions. Many, probably most, faculty members presently engage in scholarly research. While there is little question that research has often been overemphasized at the expense of undergraduate education, Shores's obliteration of the faculty's research function is also extreme. It is just possible that the problem has not occurred to him because, as an educationist, under the Library-College format he might have ample data at hand for his own research and writing. Apart from the question of research, another obstacle involving the faculty is the additional training that would be involved. Sister Helen Sheehan of Catholic University, who is interested in the educational role of the college library and whom Shores counts among his adherents, raised this issue in a 1970 review

of Library-College USA. She considered the greatest problem the lack of a suitable faculty and found it hard to imagine "any known group of professors" investing the time necessary to master general bibliographical techniques, or "any known group of librarians" interested in pursuing doctorates in subject areas in order to function in a Library-College.[19]

The indifference among the two groups, however, has not been equal. Although the Library-College movement has not caught fire anywhere, a high proportion of those individuals who have been interested are librarians. One participant at a Library-College workshop provided the following summary: "We have had few professors and administrators . . . and a high proportion of librarians. We have been holding conversations among those already converted."[20]

The overall weakness of Louis Shores's Library-College program can be ascribed to the characteristic he once used to describe himself--it starts with the solution instead of with the problems. Although Shores does not neglect to point out the need for change, he does not attempt to deal with the obstacles standing in the way of change. He chooses instead to perform a leap of faith over them in order to embrace his ideal. That weakness is not shared by the other programs under discussion.

Patricia Knapp and the Montieth Experiment

Patricia Knapp received all three of her college degrees from the University of Chicago--a B. A. in English in 1935, an M. A. in Librarianship in 1943, and a Ph. D. in the same field in 1957. After receiving her doctorate, she worked for two years as Assistant Librarian at the Wayne State University Library. From 1959 until 1965 she served as the executive secretary and director of the Montieth Library Project.[21]

Knapp's Ph. D. dissertation, written at the Graduate Library School under

the supervision of Herman Fussler, was good preparation for her work on the Montieth Project. It was a study of the Knox College Library in 1954, focusing on the relationship between the library and the college's educational program. At Knox she found that the library served the college in three ways:

1) It supplied for some courses "the essential content, the required reading in the few titles which nearly every student borrows."
2) For other courses, the library was expected to supply a large number of titles for each student to read in the general subject area with which the course dealt.
3) Finally, for still other courses, the library provided materials relevant to a wide variety of topics.

Knapp noted, however, that a good bookstore could provide the first two services. (The postwar paperback boom was well under way.) And although the library was uniquely qualified to serve the third function, it was in precisely this area that the library was called upon least.[22]

Knapp concluded that this state of affairs existed because of faculty attitudes and assumptions. She found a lack of consensus among the faculty about what a library could and should contribute to the college. Venturing onto more questionable ground, she determined that this lack of consensus and concern was prevalent because the faculty and even their best students knew what they needed to know about the library for their own work.[23] (This is highly unlikely, as Knapp herself would discover at Montieth. Those faculty and students thought they knew what they needed to know. The behavioral consequence was the same, but without the qualifier there would be little reason for librarians to acquaint or reacquaint faculty with research tools and literature structure in their own and allied fields.)

Nor were the librarians at Knox blameless for the minor role of the library;

indeed, their behavior probably reinfoced faculty attitudes. Knapp believed that they were much too absorbed in promoting reading as a recreational enterprise. She argued that "considerable evidence had shown library promotion of non-course reading to be largely ineffective," and that college librarians should develop "reading interests and habits by promoting reading as a purposeful, directed curricular activity." The Montieth Project would give her an opportunity to implement such a program.[25]

Montieth College was created in 1959 as one of eleven colleges within Wayne State University. In 1960 the school received funds from the U. S. Office of Education to conduct a study that would explore "methods of developing a more vital relationship between the library and college teaching." A project staff was appointed, with Knapp as director and Gilbert Donahue as project librarian; a research analyst with social science training was also added.[26]

Like Louis Shores, Knapp was impressed with the trend in higher education toward independent study and the consequent need for students to learn library skills. As she later explained, the project undertook to study "the establishment of a structure and machinery for a new kind of relationship between librarians and teaching faculty." The project staff and the teaching faculty were to work together, planning assignments to involve "extensive and meaningful student use of library resources . . . ."[27]

The method of the project staff was to devise a program, put it into operation as a part of the college courses, study what happened, make appropriate changes, and study it again. The program consisted of library assignments given to students in connection with their course work. Knapp and her colleagues were aware from the beginning that faculty indifference or hostility would be an insuperable obstacle. "We began with the conviction," Knapp explained, "that the key to library instructional coordination lay in the structure of the relationship

between librarians and teaching faculty." They hoped for, and worked for, acceptance in faculty groups responsible for course planning. The project even employed twenty-four bibliographical assistants from among Wayne State students, providing an assistant to each faculty member on the assumption that the instructor would thus be prompted to make use of library resources for his course assignments.[28]

But recognizing the centrality of faculty-librarian relations was not the same as adequately addressing the issue, notwithstanding the horde of bibliographical assistants. Knapp and Donahue were accepted socially by the faculty, but not professionally. Faculty members were most polite when the project staff appeared before divisional meetings to explain the program, but they had trouble understanding just what Knapp and her co-workers were about. On the first assignment, involving the use of library resources for a freshman paper, the project staff took a "sink or swim" approach toward the students' work. The students sank, dismaying their teachers and convincing some of them that freshmen could not be trusted to find sources in the library and had to be told what to read.[29]

The program's difficulties prompted the staff to make some important changes. A sensitivity to the Montieth social structure led them to change their approach. They decided to begin meeting with one full-fledged member from each division of the teaching faculty, rather than with the entire division. These individuals (who would function as gatekeepers) were already accepted by their faculty colleagues and would have no difficulty in attaining full membership in the library project staff group. Probably because of the increased leverage the librarians received from this new arrangement, they also began to take an active part in presenting assignments to students. A librarian and the instructor began presenting each library assignment to the class, since the faculty lacked the

librarians' systematic view of library organization.[30] This procedure undoubtedly improved the quality of assignment presentations and also raised the librarians' status in the eyes of the students. The final change involved taking the bibliographical assistants away from the individual instructors, reducing their number, and pooling them into a group under the direction of the project librarian. The assistants thereby perceived their umbilical relationship to the project and began to identify with it, rather than with the faculty members to whom they had been assigned.[31]

Toward the end of the experiment, the staff conducted a number of tests designed to measure library competence among the Montieth students. Some of the results demonstrated to Knapp's satisfaction, levels of library competence so far beyond that which would normally be expected that the library training must have had an effect. Moreover, the evidence from one examination which closely paralled a library assignment seemed to indicate that test performance (at least) reflected the impact of particular learning experiences. Nevertheless, Knapp and other observers were quick to admit that the test results were not very conclusive.[32]

Perhaps the most significant and useful point to emerge from the Montieth experiment was Knapp's conclusion, upon reflection, that the college library required "a unifying theoretical concept . . . ." For all their attention to social structure, she and the rest of the staff had experienced difficulty in garnering support from the faculty (and often even from students), because they had trouble explaining just what the role of the library should be in undergraduate education. It was the very problem she had encountered at Knox a decade before. The faculty, by and large, considered the library assignments generally useful but fragmented, and certainly did not believe that they required any imagination or critical thinking. Students, less generously, considered them a

form of high-school busy work. But the problems were eased considerably when the staff began presenting library use in a theoretical context, portraying the library explicitly as a system of "ways" to the information, rather than simply as a storehouse of records. This approach introduced students and faculty to two important parts of the total information system: the traditional bibliographical tools found in a library, and the networks of scholarly communication.[33]

The faculty members were pleased with the new systematic and theoretical view of the library, and they were not the only ones. Knapp found it the most gratifying part of the project, no doubt partly because of the greater acceptance by the faculty. The theoretical framework also seems to have clarified for Knapp herself the library's role in undergraduate education, and she later spoke of the library's potential "as an organized system to encourage integration of the curriculum at the epistemological level." As a result, she was convinced that a theoretical underpinning was essential to library instruction.[34]

In the years following the Montieth experiment, reflecting on the project, Knapp stressed the importance of discovery as a powerful intellectual stimulus and synthesizer. Borrowing from Winslow Hatch some vocabulary, but not the concept, she wrote at the end of 1963 that "Inquiry leads to acquiry, acquiry to further inquiry." Thus by the mid-1960s Patricia Knapp had found the intellectual and pedagogical justification of the undergraduate library, an issue with which she had been grappling for a decade. In her emphasis on theoretical justification she resembled Louis Shores, and she may have contributed to his thinking on the subject. The third major program of library instruction, the only one currently in operation, is less explicitly theoretical.[35]

Evan Farber and Earlham College

In the late 1960s, while researching his doctoral dissertation, Billy R. Wilkinson examined the libraries of several colleges and universities. He concluded that at Earlham College "a library instruction program unparalled at any college or university in the country has been developed." The individual most responsible for the program which so impressed Wilkinson was Evan Farber, who arrived at Earlham in 1962.[36]

Farber earned three degrees from the University of North Carolina: a B. A. in Political Science in 1944, an M. A. in the same subject in 1951, and a Bachelor's degree in Library Science in 1953. For seven years before going to Earlham as head librarian, he worked at Emory University for Guy Lyle as head of the serials and binding department.[37]

Like Louis Shores and Patricia Knapp, Farber's interest in library instruction grew out of particular persoral experiences. While working at Emory, he had once encountered a student wandering helplessly around the biological journals. Farber asked him if he had first looked through Biological Abstracts, only to draw a blank look in response. Farber was first shocked and then appalled to discover that the student was completing a master's degree in Biology and had never been exposed to Biological Abstracts. Later, during his first years at Earlham, he was continually made aware that students did not know how to locate information. Furthermore, the librarians found themselves answering the same questions from students, causing considerable duplication of effort and thus inefficient use of staff time. Librarians were, one of them recalled, trying to teach rudimentary library skills to students "one-by-one, catch-as-catch-can, in the frenzy of a busy reference area." Farber also found it hard to justify to himself, to say nothing of the administration, why the library should spend money for additional serials materials if they were not going to

be used very much. He believed that students needed to know about tools which would give them access to the information located in periodicals, and he was therefore determined to introduce a systematic program of library instruction that would provide students with these and other skills.[38]

The program was devised and implemented in a favorable climate. Earlham is a small (1200 students), midwestern liberal arts college located near Richmond, Indiana. It is a residential college with selective admissions policies. Classes are small and have long emphasized independent study and library use. As a school affiliated with the Society of Friends, the Quaker ethos is strong, if not pervasive, and a tradition of consensus prevails on organizational matters. Farber characterizes the campus as displaying "a closely knit sense of community and a very informal relationship among students, faculty, administration, and staff."[39]

Certain changes at the school, which occurred soon after Farber's arrival, made the environment even more hospitable. A handsome new library building was completed in 1963, and it became a major focal point of campus attention and social interaction. New educational programs and approaches were being initiated, which strengthened even more Earlham's traditional commitment to independent work. The library was designated a government documents depository, and Farber's experience in working with such documents made him determined to see that students used them. Finally, he was able to hire a reference librarian and a science librarian who were sympathetic with his objectives.[40]

Earlham's library instruction is integrated into the various courses, through a lecture-demonstration given by Farber or one of three other librarians. Several weeks before the term begins, a librarian contacts instructors of those courses for which library use appears appropriate. If the faculty member agrees, the class convenes at the library on the designated day and is met by the librarian

and the course instructor.[41] Bibliographies of appropriate reference sources are handed out, and the librarian demonstrates the use of the sources and describes various search strategies. (The first lecture-demonstrations were not terribly clear to the students, because they contained too much lecture and insufficient demonstration. Not until the librarians systematically focused on particular problems to illustrate the use of various tools--the time-honored "case study" approach--did the presentations become a useful instructional device.) Between 1965 and 1970, the program's first five years, the four librarians prepared and updated approximately 130 annotated bibliographies and met more than 200 classes.[42]

The instruction is also sequential, like the library assignments at Montieth, to meet needs of students at different points in their education. New students take a library knowledge test, itself providing a level of instruction which the librarians at Earlham consider far better than the typical guided tour of the library. Those students whose knowledge is particularly weak are singled out for special sessions, to bring their level up to that of their peers and prepare them for the instruction which will follow. Later in their freshman year, in connection with a required two-term humanities course, students are introduced to such reference sources as Library of Congress Subject Headings, Social Sciences Index, Humanities Index, Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin, and The New York Times Index. In their junior year, they learn about bibliographical tools relevant to their majors, and in their last year become acquainted with bibliographical aids which are even more specialized and individualized because of the variety of senior paper topics.[43]

Farber and his staff apparently have never sought to measure in any systematic way the impact of their library instruction.[44] They have, however, several reasons to think that the results have been significant and worthwhile. A doctoral

candidate examining the use of historical journals by students in liberal arts colleges found Earlham students more familiar with bibliographical materials in American history than were their counterparts elsewhere. Librarians also receive frequent reinforcement from alumni who have gone on to graduate school, and from transfer students comparing their newfound library skills with what they had been accustomed to at their former institution. Better bibliographies for student papers have resulted, and there has been a sharp increase in interlibrary loans.[45]

Particularly gratifying has been the favorable faculty response and the greater frequency of faculty requests for library instruction (with continuing exceptions, of course). Librarians at Earlham are an integral part of the college community and serve on all faculty committees; as a matter of course Farber even has a voice in faculty selection. Although it is not clear how much this favorable situation owes to the success of library instruction and how much to Earlham tradition, Farber evidently believes the instruction has played a vital role. He points with pride to a recent statement of the institution's educational aims, which includes the advocacy of "competence in the skills of information retrieval and the use of the library for research purposes." The committee that drafted the statement did not contain a single librarian.[46]

Any evaluation of Earlham's library instruction, especially in comparison with the short-lived Montieth experiment and the Library-College scheme, should take into account the climate in which it has fluorished--a climate which in many ways is probably unique. Although Farber believes that other campuses might benefit from learning about his work at Earlham, he is quick to emphasize that the program is not exportable. Acceptance of the librarians' efforts was greatly facilitated by Earlham's traditional sense of community, that long before Farber arrived had done much to break down the usual barriers between librarians and teaching faculty, and which made most of the faculty receptive to the scheme from

the beginning. Additional assistance came from the school's stronger commitment to teaching than to research, a method of instruction that emphasized library use, the small size of the student body, a supportive administration, and a new and inviting building.[47]

Despite (or perhaps because of) the institution's natural advantages, Earlham's library instruction is a more conservative program than the other two. Farber does not share Knapp's view that in time the teaching faculty could present library assignments without librarian input, to say nothing of Shores's vision of merging faculty and librarians. In Farber's opinion, the teaching faculty simply cannot know well enough the changing bibliographic tools and the problems connected with their use. "We disagree strongly here," he has written, "with some devotees of the library-college concept. We feel that while the teaching faculty have the central responsibility in the educational enterprise, librarians can help them carry out that responsibility much more effectively and at the same time enhance it. While the two groups--teaching faculty and librarians--can and should work together, neither one can do the other's job." Farber considers this separation of functions inherent in the faculty's orientation to the courses and the disciplines, and he emphasizes the "traditionalism, the educational conservatism of academia." He believes that "only by working through the courses, and that means through individual faculty members, can the objectives of library instruction presently be achieved."[48]

What are those objectives at Earlham? Farber and his staff want the students to: know the difference between high school and college libraries; be aware that there are reference sources for almost every topic; understand that there is a basic search structure that can be applied to most library research topics; know and accept limits to their knowledge by working with a reference librarian "when exploring new territory"; and not only use the library as a place to do bibliographic

searching, but be prepared to go beyond its resources either via interlibrary loan or by visiting other libraries.[49]

In terms of what Shores and even Knapp have proposed, this is rather tame stuff. Farber and his staff have consciously steered away from the theoretical underpinnings which inform Knapp's work.[50] Although Farber has great respect and affection for Knapp, he obviously has not been persuaded by her arguments in favor of making the "inquiry-acquiry" model an explicit cornerstone of college library instruction. "We hope we're doing some of this," Farber has written, "that is, teaching concepts and processes--but it is only a hope, because we are depending on students' abilities to draw inferences." Farber apparently believes that a more comprehensive theory of library instruction has yet to be worked out (he provides no guidelines) and that such a theory is somehow incompatible with presenting the instruction through the faculty and their courses. "We should recognize," he contends, "that if we do give library instruction only through other courses, it becomes difficult to teach concepts in order to focus on the specific tools that will permit better papers." While I can understand his reasoning, I must confess that I find Knapp more persuasive on this important point. One should remember, however, that Knapp evolved toward a theoretical foundation principally because of her need to gain faculty acceptance for the experiment at Montieth. Farber has had no comparable difficulty at Earlham.[51]

Conclusion

The chief obstacles that lie in the way of closer coordination between the library and the teaching program at most American colleges and universities are the attitudes of faculty and librarians toward the library's role. Patricia Knapp has commented more than once that faculty emphasis on subject knowledge, a

concomitant "lack of interest in teaching methodology," and a "limited perception of what real understanding and skill in the use of library resources means", all work against library attempts at instruction. Similarly, Evan Farber has referred to the teaching faculty's "lack of confidence in their librarians as colleagues in the educational process." But it is not a one-way street. Farber, Knapp, and others have observed that many academic librarians are only too glad to confine their duties to acquiring and organizing a collection for use, and being ready to assist when they are asked. Librarians have had relatively little concern for how the information is tapped.[52]

Advocates of library instruction may be able to take advantage of certain current trends. The end of the postwar "baby boom", and even a declining birth rate, may result in some smaller college and university classes, unless teachers are discharged in proportion to falling enrollments. The physical plants are already in existence, and there will be great political and bureaucratic resistance against closing at least the public institutions. Consequently, the years ahead will see greater emphasis on the concept of continuing education. Some of this emphasis will necessarily include the concept of a college education as one which provides the tools for continuing intellectual growth, and greater rhetorical attention will probably be given to library skills. Coupled with the demographic trend is the incessant outpouring of publications, a quantity which may constitute a relatively new kind of communications barrier.[53] Commenting in 1972 upon this development was the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: "The teaching of existing knowledge . . . becomes comparatively less essential to the task of higher education and the imparting of skills for continuing self-education more, particularly in independent study and through the library." In the mid-1950s Knapp perceptively noted the same trend, when she called for education which would include library skills for grappling with the

information explosion.[54]

It will be interesting to observe in the years ahead whether the climate described above has any appreciable effect on library instruction and, if it does, whether that instruction proceeds along one of the lines studied here. The barriers are formidable; any progress is likely to be correspondingly gradual.

Notes

1. Guy R. Lyle, The Administration of the College Library (New York, 1961), 1; Kenneth J. Brough, Scholar's Workshop: Evolving Conceptions of Library Service (Urbana, Ill., 1953), 19, 21. For a few exceptions to this dominant pattern, see Brough, 152-53.

2. Lyle, 1-8.

3. Harvie Branscomb, Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries (Chicago, 1940), ix.

4. Ibid., 29, 47.

5. Ibid., 80, 59-61.

6. On this point see David Hackett Fischer, Historians' Fallacies (New York, 1970).

7. Biographical Directory of Librarians in the United States and Canada, 5th edition (Chicago, 1970), 1001.

8. Louis Shores, Library-College USA: Essays on a Prototype for an American Higher Education (Tallahassee, 1970), 10, 32, 11-13. (Hereafter, this work will be cited as LC USA.)

9. Ibid., 45, 29.

10. Shores, LC USA, 11, 29, 45-46, 68, 22, 26.

11. Ibid., 25, 6-7, 49-50, 145-146, 71. On one occasion Shores proposed that the librarian teach not only a "where to find it" course, but also a foundational

course "offering an encyclopedic summary of the knowledge most significant to mankind." LC USA, 6. Because of his commitment to a variety of disciplines, Shores believed, the librarian was the person best suited for the task. No doubt Shores's experience for many years as editor of Collier's Encyclopedia had something to do with this suggestion.

12. Ibid., 52, 61, 9. See also 63, 75.

13. Ibid., 55, 149, 25, 48, 50. See also 7, 48.

14. Ibid., 26, 29, 200-201, 34, 74-75, 26-27, 48, 206.

15. Ibid., 15, 16, 33, 55, 204, 12, 54, 146. In his many writings, Shores has made repeated reference to the inspiration provided by Carlyle's line. See LC USA, 2, 66, 159, 168, 179, 191.

16. Ibid., 191, 195.

17. Ibid., 69-70, x-xi.

18. Ibid., 52, 203-204, 25, 40, 72-73; Eli M. Oboler, "Library-College Bible," Library Journal (May 15, 1967), 1909.

19. Sheehan, review of LC USA in Catholic Library World, 42 (October, 1970), 123.

20. B. Lamar Johnson in Oboler, "Library-College Bible."

21. Biographical Directory of Librarians, 5th ed., 600.

22. Patricia B. Knapp, College Teaching and the College Library (Chicago, 1959), iii, 2, 93-94.

23. Ibid., 93-94.

24. One observer, who has earned a Ph. D. in history as well as a degree in librarianship, made this same point when he wrote that "faculty members do not really grasp the difference between expert knowledge and bibliographic control." John G. Williamson, "Swarthmore College's 'Teaching Library' Proposals," Drexel Library Quarterly 7 (July and October, 1971), 210.

25. Knox, College Teaching, 95.

26. Knapp, The Montieth College Library Experiment (New York, 1966), 12-15; Robert Jordan, "Library-College Experiment," Library Journal, 92 (February 15, 1967), 752-53.

27. Knapp, Montieth, 11-12.

28. Stanley Gwynn, review of Montieth in Library Quarterly, 37 (July, 1967), 299; Knapp, Montieth, 16, 115, 127.

29. Gwynn, review, 300; Knapp, Montieth, 282-83.

30. Knapp believed that in time the instructor might be able once again to present the assignment by himself, because he would have acquired a systematic view of the library. Knapp, Montieth, 107.

31. Knapp, Montieth, 33-34, 103, 106, 32-33, 107.

32. Ibid., 77; Gwynn, review, 299.

33. Knapp, Montieth, 81-83, 89.

34. Knapp, "Involving the Library in an Integrated Learning Environment," in Dan Bergen and E. D. Duryea, eds., Libraries and the College Climate of Learning (Syracuse, 1964), 34; Knapp, Montieth, 92-93.

35. Knapp, Montieth, 275.

36. Billy R. Wilkinson, Reference Services for Undergraduate Students; Four Case Studies (Metuchen, 1972), 304.

37. Biographical Directory of Librarians, 5th ed., 331; Evan I. Farber and Ruth Walling, eds., The Academic Library: Essays in Honor of Guy R. Lyle (Metuchen, 1974), v-vi.

38. Farber, conversation with the author, January 21, 1975; Farber, "Library Instruction Throughout the Curriculum: Earlham College Program," in John Lubans, Jr., Educating the Library User (New York, 1974), 148-149; James R. Kennedy, "Integrated Library Instruction," Library Journal, 95 (April 15, 1970), 1450.

39. Farber, "Library Instruction," 145-46. See also Thomas J. Cottle, "A Learning Place Called Earlham," Change (January-February, 1971), 52-59.

40. Farber, "Library Instruction," 148-49; Farber, "College Librarians and the University-Library Syndrome," in Farber and Walling, eds., The Academic Library, 19.

41. Farber may have borrowed this characteristic from the Montieth program. See above, pp. 14-15, and Knapp, Montieth, 33.

42. Kennedy, "Integrated Library Instruction," 1450-53.

43. Ibid., 1451-52; Farber, "Library Instruction," 149.

44. Earlham has lacked the federal funds which financed the relatively rigorous but largely inconclusive studies conducted at Montieth. Perhaps the reaults of those studies helped demonstrate to Farber the difficulty of more sophisticated measurement.

45. Farber, "Library Instruction," 159; Kennedy, "Integrated Library Instruction," 1453.

46. Farber, "Library Instruction," 159, 147-48; Wilkinson, 304; Farber, conversation with the author, January 21, 1975; Cottle, "Learning Place," 55.

47. Kennedy, 1452; Farber, "Library Instruction," 148. See also Cottle, 52-59.

48. Farber, "Library Instruction," 157.

49. Ibid., 158.

50. Since this paper was written, a reference librarian at Earlham has published an article which advocates a more theoretical approach to bibliographic instruction. See Elizabeth Frick, "Information Structure and Bibliographic Instruction," Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1 (September, 1975), 12-14.

51. Farber, "Library Instruction," 159-60.

52. Farber, "College Librarians," 17-18; Knapp, College Teaching, 94-95; Knapp, cited in Anne B. Passarelli and Millicent D. Abel, "Programs of Undergraduate Libraries and Problems in Educating Library Users," in Lubans, ed., Educating the Library User, 119; Knapp, "The Meaning of the Montieth College Library Program for Library Education," Journal of Education for Librarianship, 6 (Fall, 1965), 118; Kennedy, 1453.

53. See Manfred Kochen, "Progress in Documentation: WISE: A World Information Synthesis and Encyclopedia," Journal of Documentation, 28 (December, 1972), 322.

54. Passarelli and Abel, "Programs," 115; Knapp, "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," in Louis Shores, Robert Jordan,

and John Harvey, eds., The Library-College (Philadelphia, 1966), 17. One can accept much of Knapp's argument without necessarily agreeing with her that "competence in the use of the library is one of the liberal arts." Ibid., 26.